REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 16-18, and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,181,968 to Limousin. Claims 2-6, 19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Limousin in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,476,485 to Weinberg et al. Claims 7-15, 20, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Limousin in view of Weinberg et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,278,894 to Salo et al. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 18, and 27, as amended, are directed to a method and corresponding system that provides a single pacing pulse in a cross-chamber configuration to simultaneously capture both the right and left ventricles. According to the method, simultaneous capture of both ventricles is achieved by delivering the single pacing pulse between an electrode associated with the left ventricle and an electrode in the right ventricle, which results in the synchronous capture of both ventricles. In other words, using a bipolar electrode configuration that includes an electrode in the right ventricle and an electrode on the left side of the heart, the claimed invention achieves simultaneous, biventricular capture with a single pacing pulse.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 18 and 27 based on the Limousin patent. According to the Examiner, the Limousin patent discloses each and every element found in Applicant's claim 1, 18, and 27, and the Examiner points to column 1, lines 5-20, column 2, lines 6-26, and column 3, lines 7-12 which purportedly describe each feature. However, a read of each of those portions of the Limousin patent (not to mention the entire patent) reveals that Limousin simply teaches a biventricular stimulation system that stimulates both ventricles, but fails to disclose Applicant's novel approach to achieve biventricular stimulation. Nowhere does Limousin disclose using a single pacing pulse delivered between a right ventricular electrode and a left ventricular electrode to capture both ventricles with the single pacing pulse.

Claims 2-6, 19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Limousin in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,476,485 to Weinberg et al.

As described above, Limousin fails to teach or suggest a method of biventricular pacing that delivers a **single** pacing pulse in a cross-chamber configuration between the right and left ventricles to synchronously capture both ventricles. Likewise, Weinberg et al. fail to teach or suggest delivering a single pacing pulse between an electrode in the right ventricle and an electrode associated with the left ventricle. Therefore, the prior art, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to teach applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 1, 18, and 27.

The Salo et al. patent is directed to a system that measures impedance by delivering AC signals between right and left ventricular leads. However, as with Limousin and Weinberg et al. Salo et al. fail to teach or in any way suggest delivering a single stimulation pulse between a left-side electrode and a right-side electrode to capture the left and right heart chambers with the single pulse.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

4/27/05
Date

Derrick W. Reed
Patent Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,138
818-493-2200

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 36802